[29th January 1936

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" The recommendations of the district board are in the main followed by the Government. Whenever proposals are made, they are published for eliciting opinion and further information is obtained. And if any changes have to be made, they are made and then the proposals are confirmed."

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—" May I know whether this principle now adumbrated for the benefit of this House and for future Governments that electoral circles have been reconstituted for the removal of inequalities in the voting strength has been followed in the case of all the district boards in the Presidency or in all cases in respect of the South Arcot District Board itself? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" As far as possible, whenever such a course is considered necessary, the district board is consulted."

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—" May I take it that the Government will set right such inequalities only when they consider it necessary for their purpose and not as a matter of policy or principle? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" Whenever such a matter is brought to the notice of the Government, they fully consider the question on its merits."

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—" In reply to clause (c) of the question, 'whether it is a fact that revenue firkas were adopted as units of district board electoral circles at the time of elections in 1932' it is said 'Yes.' May I ask what tangible reasons the Government have for meddling with that principle now? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" The answer to clause (b) says that 'as the original division of electoral circles resulted in an unequal distribution of voters among the circles, the district board urged a re-division of the electoral circles'."

Reasons for the variation of the number of villages constituting the electoral circles of the South Arcot District Board.

* 556 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state what are the reasons for the variations in the number of villages constituting each of the electoral circles proposed to be formed for the coming elections to the South Arcot District Board?

A.—Attention is invited to the answer given to clause (b) of question No. 555.

Re-shuffling the constituencies of the South Arcot District Board.

* 557 *Q.*—Mr. P. RATNAVELU THEVAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) on what date the notification terminating the life of the present District Board of South Arcot was issued and from what date the Board was to cease to function;

29th January 1936]

(*b*) whether any proposals were received from the District Board for a fresh delimitation of the district board constituencies;

(*c*) on what date the proposals, if any, from the District Board were received;

(*d*) on what principles the Board's delimitation proposals were based, and whether Government will kindly place the papers on the table of the House; and

(*e*) what orders were issued by the Government on the proposals of the Board, and when they were issued?

A.—(*a*) The notification was published in Part I-A of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 12th November 1935. According to this notification, the term of the existing members of the South Arcot District Board expires on the noon of 31st December 1935.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) The proposals were received by the Government on 24th July 1935.

(*d*) Attention is invited to the answer to clause (*b*) of question No. 555. The Government are not prepared to place the papers on the table.

(*e*) The proposals were approved by the Government in G.O. No. 3680, L. & M., dated 10th September 1935, with a few modifications.

Reasons for the decision of the Government per contra *to the resolutions of the South Kanara District Board.*

* 558 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether any of the resolutions of the South Kanara District Board passed at the special meeting held last month (as desired by the Government) in regard to the proposals of the Inspector of Local Boards have been accepted; and

(*b*) if not, what reasons weighed with the Government in coming to a decision contrary to the resolutions of the board?

A.—(*a*) The suggestion of the South Kanara District Board regarding the splitting of the old Kasaragod circle was accepted.

(*b*) The Government are not prepared to give the reasons for not accepting the other suggestions made by the district board.

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—"May I know whether it is not a fact that Government declined in the first instance to accept any of the proposals of the board regarding the regrouping of the circles?"

The Hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—"When a proposal has been made by the Inspector and after further representations are received, the Government consider the proposal and if it is desirable, they confirm it."